

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully studied the outstanding Official Action. The present amendment is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are hereby respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of an interview granted on 14 September 2005 to Applicants' representative David Zviel, registration number 41,392. Pat Salce from TQAS was also consulted. The substance of the interview is included in the Interview Summary.

In the interview, amendment to the claims to overcome the 101 rejection was discussed. Upon consultation with Pat Salce, some suggestions were given to amend the claims in order to conform with 35 USC 101. Additionally, Applicants' representative has agreed to cancel claims 15 – 17 to expedite the allowance process.

Applicants are also canceling claims 32 – 34 because claims 32 – 34 are apparatus claims corresponding to method claims 15 – 17.

Claims 1 – 5, 7 – 22, and 24 – 42 were examined. Claims 15 – 17 and 32 – 34 have been canceled, and new claims 43 and 44 have been added. Thus, claims 1 – 5, 7 – 14, 18 – 22, 24 – 31 and 35 – 44 are now pending in the application.

The Examiner's indication that the previous rejection of claims 1 – 42 has been withdrawn is gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 1 – 5, 7 – 22, and 24 – 42 stand rejected under 35 USC 101. The Examiner takes the position that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the digital signature cryptographic method is performed by a computing device, and that the method also comprises assigning e_1, \dots, e_{n+v} as the digital signature of the message.

The amendments to claim 1 are supported, inter alia, by Fig. 1 and by the following places in the specification: from the paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4 through the second full paragraph on page 4; and from the top of page 8 through the first full paragraph on page 9.

The amendments to claim 1 are in accordance with the suggestions given in the interview and are believed to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 101 of claim 1.

Amended claim 1 is therefore deemed allowable.

Claims 2 – 5 and 7 – 14 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and recite additional patentable subject matter.

Claims 2 – 5 and 7 – 14 are therefore deemed allowable.

Claims 15 – 17 have been canceled without prejudice. Therefore, any discussion regarding the rejections raised in the Official Action with respect to claims 15 – 17 is deemed to be unnecessary.

Claim 18 has been amended to recite a computer system for generating a signature, and that the signature processor is also operative to assign e_1, \dots, e_{n+v} as the digital signature of the message.

The amendments to claim 18 are supported similarly to the amendments to claim 1.

The amendments to claim 18 are in accordance with the suggestions given in the interview and are believed to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 101 of claim 18.

Amended claim 18 is therefore deemed allowable.

Claims 19 – 22 and 24 – 31 depend directly or indirectly from claim 18 and recite additional patentable subject matter.

Claims 19 – 22 and 24 – 31 are therefore deemed allowable.

Claims 32 – 34 have been canceled without prejudice. Therefore, any discussion regarding the rejections raised in the Official Action with respect to claims 32 – 34 is deemed to be unnecessary.

Claim 35 has been amended to recite that the digital signature is generated by a computer system, and that e_1, \dots, e_{n+v} is assigned as the digital signature of the message.

The amendments to claim 35 are supported similarly to the amendments to claim 1.

The amendments to claim 35 are in accordance with the suggestions given in the interview and are believed to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 101 of claim 35.

Amended claim 35 is therefore deemed allowable.

Claim 36 is a product-by-process claim depending from claim 1.

Claim 36 is therefore deemed allowable.

Claims 37 – 39 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and recite additional patentable subject matter.

Claims 37 – 39 are therefore deemed allowable.

Claims 40 – 42 depend directly or indirectly from claim 18 and recite additional patentable subject matter.

Claims 40 – 42 are therefore deemed allowable.

New claims 43 and 44 have been added.

New claim 43 is supported, inter alia, by Fig. 1 and by the specification from the top of page 8 through the first full paragraph on page 9.

Claim 43 depends from claim 1 and recites additional patentable subject matter.

Claim 43 is therefore deemed allowable.


Claim 44 is supported similarly to claim 43.

Claim 44 depends from claim 18 and recites additional patentable subject matter.

Claim 44 is therefore deemed allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



JULIAN H. COHEN
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
26 West 61st Street
New York, New York 10023
Reg. No. 20302
Tel. No. (212) 708-1887